

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

ALBIHNS STOCKHOLM AB
Box 5581 Linnégatan 2
114 85 STOCKHOLM

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

11-05-2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference
73747-78311

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/SE 2005/000036

International filing date (day/month/year)

17-01-2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

16-01-2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

H04Q 7/38, G06K 17/00

Applicant

FIRST AID CARD ENTERPRISES AB ET AL

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/SE
Patent- och registreringsverket
Box 5055
S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88

Authorized officer

Catharina Karlsson /itw

Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/SE 2005/000036

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE 2005/000036

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not yet been furnished:

- ☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).
☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

The priority is not valid for those parts of the application which relate to the Swedish priority document, 0400084-0. The US priority, 60/481,902, has not been checked since the ISA does not have access to that priority document.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE 2005/000036

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The question whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application

☒ claims Nos. 2, 5 - 10

because:

☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. _____
relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____
are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ The claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported
by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 2, 5 - 10

☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of
the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

☐ has not been furnished

☐ does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

☐ has not been furnished

☐ does not comply with the standard

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not
comply with the technical requirements provided for in the Annex C-*bis* of the Administrative Instructions.

☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/SE 2005/000036

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1, 3-4, 11-21</u>	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	<u>1, 3-4, 11-21</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1, 3-4, 11-21</u>	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The claimed invention

The present invention solves the problem that emergency personnel or medical staff do not have access to identity and medical information of an injured person.

The following documents were cited in the International Search Report:

D1: WO 0213132 A1
D2: GB 2360862 A
D3: US 20030200227 A1
D4: WO 0241237 A1

D1 discloses an apparatus and a method for identifying an article and retrieving stored data about an article or a person. A database (12) can be accessed by individuals from communication terminals, the individuals inputting or updating their own personalised information thereon, (page 8 lines 22-24). The database includes both identities and personalised information, (page 8 lines 29-page 9 line 3). The database is in communication with at least one mobile communication terminal (17). The terminal has reading means (3), adapted to determine and communicate the identity of a transponder (1), (abstract), carried by an individual, (page 15 line 13). The database is adapted to match the identity of the transmission provided by the mobile communication terminal to the personalised information, (page 12 lines 27-28). Personalised information and identification is provided to and is displayed on the mobile communication terminal,

.../...

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: BOX V

(page 13 line 6) .

Document D1 is considered to represent the closest prior art.

The invention according to claims 1, 3 and 19-21 differs from the apparatus in D1 in that there are two databases. However, to a person skilled in the art, it is an obvious constructional change to separate a database into two databases if a particular application requires that. The change can only be regarded as inventive, if the separation presents unexpected effects or properties in relation to the rest of the range. However, no such effects or properties are indicated in the application.

Consequently, claims 1, 3 and 19-21 are considered to not involve an inventive step.

The mobile communication terminal according to claim 4 differs from D1 in that D1 fails to suggest that the terminal is adapted for manual input of notifications, which are communicated via a third database to a hospital. The notifications are independent of the received information.

Due to this feature, the hospital has information on individuals in an accident.

However, it is common practice that assisting personnel inform the hospital about the types of injuries of individuals. One selection, obvious to person skilled in the art, it is that the information is transmitted as an SMS to the hospital. Therefore, the feature of claim 4 does not involve an inventive step.

The features of claims 11-15 are known from D1.

The claims 16-18 are considered to involve particular detail executions obvious to a person skilled in the art.

Consequently, the invention according to claims 1, 3-4 and 11-21 is not considered to involve an inventive step.